

REMARKS

1. The undersigned thanks the examiners Kheim D. Nguen and David Coleman for discussing the rejections with the undersigned in a telephone interview on October 11, 2005. The interview focused on the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over U.S. patent no. 6,667,511 to Fang. The Office Action states on page 3 that Fang teaches a dielectric 108 and a dielectric 162 which are "formed simultaneously". The undersigned pointed out that Fang's dielectric layers 108 and 162 are not formed simultaneously. Dielectric 108 is shown in Fang's Fig. 5c, and described in column 6, lines 10-13. Dielectric 162 is shown in Fig. 5f and described in column 7, lines 45-47.

An agreement was reached that the two dielectric layers were not formed simultaneously. Mr. Coleman stated that the 102 rejection of Claim 1 would be withdrawn.

2. Claims 1-17 and 30-38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over Fang.

Claims 2-17 and 30-38 depend from Claim 1, whose rejection is to be withdrawn as discussed above.

Any questions regarding this case can be addressed to the undersigned at the telephone number below.

EXPRESS MAIL LABEL NO.:
EV 679 030 714 US

Respectfully submitted,



Michael Shenker
Patent Attorney
Reg. No. 34,250
Telephone: (408) 392-9250, Ext. 212

Law Offices Of
MacPherson Kwok Chen & Heid LLP
1762 Technology Drive, Suite 226
San Jose, CA 95110